Filed at the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the matter of: Auction No.58 pro se bidder, Ameer Flippin's Reply to
Opposition by

Numerous Parties concerning the issue of licenses following a
Petition

To Deny

AMEER FLIPPIN, | WT Docket No.05-149
Pro Se Bidder/Plaintiff | Report No. AUC-58

vs. | Appellate Case #:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS |
COMMISSION, et.al. |
Respondents |

EX-PARTE REPLY TO OPPOSITION OF EX-PARTE MOTION AND PETITION TO DENY LONG-FORMS FILED BY PARTICIPANTS IN AUCTION NO.58; BY PRO SE BIDDER AMEER FLIPPIN

Public Notice DA 05-459 indicates that time frame for filing Petitions To Deny. The title of the Public Notice reads as follows, "Down Payments due March 7, 2005, FCC Forms 601 and 602 due March 7, 2005, Final Payments due March 21, 2005 Ten-Day Petition to Deny Period." All necessary documents were filed with the Federal Communications Commission "the Commission" either prior to or during the time period specified by Public Notice. The Petitions To Deny were filed on at least two separate occasions. This was done in an effort to insure the receipt of documents considering the extenuating circumstances created by the "Commission" and the United States Federal Government. I, Ameer Flippin, filed a motion requesting the

Filed at the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

electronic passcodes and User IDs necessary to access and file documents via the appropriate ULS system. However, the Commission refused to respond to the correspondence. Therefore, documents were manually filed with FCC Secretary Marlene Dortch at 445 Twelfth Street, SW, Washington, DC 20554.

47 CFR section 1.939 Petitions To Deny, partially reads as follows:

(a) Who may file. Any party in interest may file with the Commission a petition to deny any application listed in a Public Notice as accepted for filing,

An issue of licenses would be inconsistent with the public interest given the compensatory and punitive damages created from an entities build-out of a network, during the time which the case is on appeal in the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia Circuit. Jurisdiction was removed to the federal appellate circuit courts upon the filing of Notices of Appeal, which were executed. Electronic Service was executed on Auction No.58 participants, while an "Ex-Parte Motion for Service by a U.S. Marshal was filed at the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia Circuit. This was to insure proper service. The very conflict of determining the High & Winning Bidder brings into question the procedures followed during the auction process, which was created and structured to insure participation by small Designated Entities. The Designated Entities have upper financial parameters for participation in C & F "set-aside blocks." Please find an affadivit attached which affirms Ameer Flippin's Reply to the Oppositions filed by numerous Auction No.58 Participating Entities.

Filed at the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

I declare "UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY" that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTION DATE: May 10th, 2005

SIGNATURE____

Pro Se Bidder, Ameer Flipppin 2053 Wilson Road Memphis, TN 38116 (901)216-0195